DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 575 SP 019 509

AUTHOR Haberman, Martin
TITLE The Legacy of Teacher Education, 1980-2000.
PUB DATE Dec 81
NOTE 57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Houston, TX, February 17-20, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Curriculum Design; *Educational Psychology; Educational Research; *Educational Trends; Foundations of Education; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Relevance (Education); *Schools of Education; Social Change; Specialization; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Educators; Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

In a broad overview of teacher education, the challenges that faced four generations of teacher educators are considered as background to the issues now confronting the fifth generation. The major contribution of the first generation was to set out the fields which were to comprise the content of professional study--pedagogy, curriculum, educational psychology, and the history and philosophy of education. The legacy of the second generation of teacher educators was establishing teacher education in the college and university setting and making the study of education an organized academic enterprise. The third generation of teacher educators used its university base to broaden the range of specialities and sub-specialties which now characterize professional education. The fourth generation was challenged in terms of social relevance and responded with systems for making teacher education more accountable to the graduates, the profession, the public, and the government. The challenges now facing teacher educators lie in meeting the need to consolidate and reshape previous legacies rather than in staking out new frontiers. The heavy emphasis upon educational psychology which has dominated not only teacher education but also educational research is questionable, and the need now is to insure that prospective teachers have equal opportunities to study the ways of learning and teaching derived from other academic disciplines. In exploring current and future trends in teacher education, other issues are brought into consideration: the trend toward over-specialization, the changing relationship between the school of education and the public school, the status of educational research, and the role and responsibilities of teachers and teacher educators in society. The trend to redefine education as a personal, rather than as a common good, is seen as narrowing goals and limiting the way in which teachers view their work. If the fifth generation of teacher educators can generate a national reconsideration of education so that it is once again accepted as a common good, their legacy will be a great contribution. (JD)

ED212575

The Legacy of Teacher Education, 1980 - 2000

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARTIN HABERMAN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✔ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Martin Haberman, Dean
Division of Urban Outreach
Univ. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

and Editor,
Journal of Teacher Education

December, 1981

SP 019509

There are many ways to define history. Mathematicians might refer to the process of finding and interpreting historical documents as collecting a non-random factual base. Psychologists might regard first-person recollections of the past as selective perception, while anthropologists might refer to such data as folk culture. Writers often regard recollections of the past as simply elaborate nostalgia. The definition of history I prefer is that it is the cumulated prejudices of those who have chosen to write. These varied views of the process of generalizing about the past and projecting trends into the future may wrankle those whose professional identity is wrapped up in a methodology they refer to as historiography, but the diversity of views regarding what history is encourages me to try my hand at a brief overview of teacher education. I do not presume to suggest that the past I describe is the best explanation of what has "really" occurred; I also expect that my projections of the future may prove to be less than perfect.

The contributions of American teacher educators encompass five legacies--four that have essentially run their course. The fifth one will be our contribution to succeeding generations of teacher educators. Unlike many periods designated by historians, these legacies are not neat. They do not all begin and end with critical events on memorable dates; neither are they of discrete or equal duration. The legacies of teacher education have occurred as genuine history does, on a broken front, in an overlapping manner, in time categories which are not mutually exclusive. As I describe them, therefore, you will note that some of us are still engaged

in professional activities which are more characteristic of a previous era. This is not a pejorative comment implying that some of us are anachronisms. Since teacher education is such a complex enterprise it may very well be that those who still deal with issues which I describe as generally resolved in some previous stage may still be exerting a significant influence in shaping the present and future.

The legacy of the first generation of teacher educators spans about one hundred years from the early 19th century through the present one. The major contribution of this group was to set out the fields which were to comprise the content of professional study--pedagogy, curriculum, educational psychology, history and philosophy of education. These individuals perceived of themselves as practitioners or scholars and not necessarily as contributors to any heritage, let alone a common heritage. With the benefit of hindsight, it is now clear that, taken together, the effect of what they did was to stake out the substantive areas. The subsequent development of this content now comprises most of what is in state license requirements, most of the courses offered in preservice courses, almost all the titles of the departments in which Education professors are housed and most of all, the conceptual frames by which we take in and analyze the events of schooling.

The legacy of the second generation of teacher educators was concentrated in the first half of this century. They, too, did not necessarily perceive themselves to be part of any movement

but their cumulative contribution was to ensconse teacher education in the bosom of the multi-purpose college and university. They started departments and schools as well as particular professorial chairs. They legitimized the work of their predecessors by making the study of Education an organized academic enterprise. Some of the very same individuals who were influential in delimiting the fields of study in the latter stages of the first generation, also made critical contributions to this legitimizing generation. We can now perceive that working in their diverse ways and in varied institutional settings they achieved a common result. Teacher education was given a seat at the academic roundtable: several inches lower and on wheels but a seat nonetheless.

The legacy of the third generation of teacher educators spans the middle years of this century. This generation used its university base to broaden the range of specialties and subspecialties which now characterizes professional education. Motivated in large part by the influence of advanced graduate study in universities and by requests from public schools for more specialized practitioners, this third legacy differentiated an occupation comprised of only two roles--teachers and principals--into dozens of interrelated occupations, each with some undergirding university preparation. Again, these are not mutually exclusive legacies. Many of those who participated in legitimizing Education as a university study were still around to help differentiate the initial broad fields into the specialties.

Our fourth legacy is that of our immediate predecessors and, while many behave as if it is still at its zenith, it is actually a period in the process of passing. The essential characteristic of this fourth legacy has been shaped by a quest for social utility.* John Kennedy once remarked that Willy Mays knew more about the ballistics of a batted ball than any physicist who ever lived. From today's vantage we know this quip to be nonsense. The importance of the remark is that it reflected how most people felt at the time. Doing things was the only reality and doing things for some social purpose was the greatest good. In response--and all American education including teacher education is a response to its social and university settings--teacher educators of every stripe began raising a single issue: Does teacher education have any social relevance or is it narcissistic, i.e., convoluted back on itself in some self-serving manner. Coming out to take up the challenge, teacher educators charged into causes which would demonstrate that we could be useful in achieving social purposes, i.e., Head Start, day care, integration, education of the disadvantaged, bilingual, multicultural, sex equity and education of those with handicapping conditions. This fourth legacy was comprised primarily of individual teacher educators not acting in any preplanned or concerted way. Nevertheless, their efforts cumulated into an overall effect; one which is, to some degree, still functioning. But the social impetus for the great society has shifted dramatically. In former times teacher educators seeking to equalize educational opportunity could base their efforts

* Whitehead was dealing with this point when he defined education as "the art of the utilization of knowledge."

on "the law of the land" or upon the achievement of some national mission. Those teacher educators still involved in this legacy must now claim some higher authority than the public will as the legitimization of their actions.

In sum, this fourth generation of teacher educators moved us from debating the issue of educational opportunity to becoming involved in its realization. The legacy of this generation is that teacher education will forever into the future be judged by its relevance--its effect on practices in schools and society. The contribution of this fourth generation has been to remove much of the protection of being in the university and to, in effect, threaten the contribution of our second legacy by reraising the question of whether teacher education belongs in the university at all--whether it should not better be returned to the schools or to some other institution in order to achieve ultimate relevance. As a result of the efforts of our fourth generation, teacher education will never again be overlooked or be held unaccountable, or be able to claim immunity because we are university folk with no control over the bureaucratic settings inhabited by our graduates. For good and for ill, the fourth legacy has forced us to give up the luxury of the spectator calling down advice, to don uniforms and to enter the game.

In review, it is possible to describe the various generations of our teacher educator forebearers in terms of their cumulated influences. I have attributed various overall effects to four generations which can be viewed as legacies. These legacies

were not always received with unconditioned glee but were sometimes passed like hot potatoes through nervous hands. The first generation was challenged to justify the study of teaching in terms of content and they responded by defining a range of what might be studied. The second generation was challenged in terms of appropriateness--university or public school--and responded by lodging teacher education in the university. The third generation was challenged by the ethic of the university--to crunch pedagogy into certain forms of scholarship and research--and responded with differentiations which narrowed the expertise of education professors and differentiated the roles of school practitioners. The fourth generation was challenged in terms of social relevance and responded with systems for making teacher education more accountable to the graduates, the profession, the public, and the government.

The fifth legacy is the one to which we all currently contribute and the next two decades will be a period for shaping it. We have a remarkable opportunity to leave our profession a better one than we inherited. What will be the nature of our contribution?

By the year 2000 most of the present leadership in teacher education will be thoroughly retired, recently retired or about to retire. What form of educational endowment will we pass on to our successors; to our younger colleagues, to our students and to the public?

While there are reasonable differences among us there are also strong common bonds. I would like us to consider what some of

those commitments might be and to reflect together on our professional mortality. As we begin the final act of our only professional careers, how do we want to be remembered? What final efforts do we want to make? What last influences do we want to exert? What are the causes we wish to espouse during the maturest stage of our careers when we are most experienced, ostensibly the wisest and supposedly the most free to be concerned with the well being of others? As I describe the issues which will be decided in order to shape our legacy, I hope that you will see them--or most of them--as a shared professional heritage that we can work on together. If we fail to reach substantial common agreements by the year 2000 teacher education may be a fractionated system with no state laws which limit licensure to those who have completed university programs of preparation. If we succeed in defining some basic, common goals our legacy may be the conservation of the best of what preceding generations have accomplished. This may seem to be a modest contribution in comparison to the preceding four. Actually, it would be a remarkable achievement considering the pressures being exerted on the larger society and the university to ignore or diminish teacher education.

We are not the first generation of teacher educators who seek to influence the total university, the public,or the state legislature. We are, however, the first generation which will spend more effort preventing regressive changes than initiating reforms. Our challenge is to conserve without being protectionist

and to mitigate the external pressures to accept a diminished role by making decisive self improvements of our own determination.

We are currently faced with critical issues which seek to reopen and reevaluate the accomplishments of our predecessors: that we derive from accepted fields of knowledge; that we belong in universities; that we contribute to specialized, professional studies; and that we are socially relevant. Our response to these critical issues will test whether we can function as a field of inquiry which is revised through reflection, theory, practice and research, or whether we will function as a religion defending against revisionism.

Our first critical issue deals with the question of whether we are to be limited to the selection of parent disciplines by the first generation of teacher educators or whether we should re-examine and revise our knowledge bases. I refer here to the question of what are the foundations of teacher education.

Any one way of knowing is not only an advantage in that it provides a special set of insightful constructs but a disadvantage since it precludes other ways. The power of any single way of knowing--power refers to the ability to account for existing data and the ability to predict future data--is also a blinder which prevents us from gaining insights from alternative procedures of analysis. It is inevitable, therefore, that once we specialize or channel our knowledge generation through one discipline we have limited our potential for understanding. This is Haberman's Law of

15 per cent: "Any single academic discipline can explain up to 15 per cent of what is happening in any situation involving human interaction." Actually, the typical theorist or researcher represents only a facet or school of his/her discipline so that this potential for 15 per cent is narrowed still further.

The first issue we face in building our legacy to teacher education is whether we in the university are willing to recognize the potential inherent in all the studies we tell students will liberally educate them, or whether there is a mystical hierarchy in general education. And further, are we in teacher education willing to recognize the professional applications of constructs in the social sciences, the humanities and the natural sciences, or will we continue to limit ourselves to the few disciplines identified by the first generation of teacher educators? We should consider the great promise psychology as a discipline must have held out to the educated mind at the beginning of this century and ask ourselves if the same degree of potential vis a vis other studies is still there.

It must be noted that psychology as a university discipline has established its academic credibility by dealing with learning and behavior in lower forms of life. Those psychologists concerned with humans are still fighting a battle for recognition within their own field. Obviously, they cannot be a "hard" science if they seek to explain human behavior.

The conundrum, however, is that while human psychologists fight for recognition with their own colleagues, they have established almost complete hegemony over all other university subjects which seek to explain human behavior. The average person--college educated or not--mistakenly believes that psychology as an academic discipline is primarily concerned with understanding the human condition and further, that it is the most complete form of explanation and prediction of human behavior. Simply stated, most people believe that if they study psychology they will understand themselves and others.

I recently read through the syllabi of several psychology courses included in the general-liberal studies of undergraduates. Permit me to share portions of a very typical catalog blurb. "Course title: Understanding Human Behavior. General topics covered include sensation, motivation, perception, learning, memory, maturation, personality, development, and therapy. Weekly lectures deal with the brain, consciousness and sleep, altered states of consciousness, sensory deprivation, subliminal perception, motivation and hunger, sexual motivation, stress, conditioning, memory, pain and hypnosis, genetic psychology, emotional development, cognitive development, personality, personality tests, parapsychology and persuasion."

There is, of course, much that can be learned from studying these topics. The question, however, is the connection between these topics and the use of the grandiose title, "Understanding

Human Behavior." Is it not possible to conceive of other courses in biology, zoology, chemistry, physics, sociology, anthropology, literature, art, communications, history, political science, economics, architecture, physiology, linguistics, geology, geography, pediatrics, gerontology, law, government, agriculture, criminal justice, comparative religion, or philosophy which might carry the title, "Understanding Human Behavior" with equal or greater validity than a course in psychology? The twenty-five disciplines which I have just cited are, I am certain, the low side of an estimate of how many university subject matters contribute substantially to an educated person's understanding of human behavior. For any single subject matter, especially psychology which is one of the newer disciplines, to assume this course title is a form of academic hubris.

In psychological studies involving people the independent variables are manipulations or treatments of internal conditions in individuals and the dependent variables are some form of behavioral change (learning) which the individual will supposedly manifest in a variety of settings. The factors controlling behavior are assumed to reside in the individual.

In every other social science the independent variables are manipulations or treatments of factors in the environment and the dependent variables are common forms of behavior which different individuals will be expected to make in response to the same external conditions. The factors controlling behavior are assumed to exist outside of individuals.

The psychological way of knowing assumes that changing individuals will ultimately affect the social order. Social scientists assume the reverse: that changes in the environment, i.e., organizations, institutions, social structures, or technology will control and shape individual behavior and ultimately even individual perceptions.

While it is possible to theorize about the influence of both external and internal controls--and "social psychologists" do so--the cannons of research methodology force a choice between the factors designated as independent variables and those designated as dependent ones. Whoever does research must make such a forced choice and in so doing reveal their true assumptions about where they believe the primary locus of control over human behavior resides.

Examining the work of psychological theorists will reveal how their way of knowing hinders as well as deepens our understanding of human behavior. In comparing the developmental theories of Piaget, Erikson and Robert Sears, Henry W. Maier, himself a psychologist, tries to distinguish between how these three eminent theorists explain the capacity of individuals to hurdle the obstacles in their environment.

> "In viewing the means by which the individual hurdles the obstacles in his environment, Piaget anchors his faith in the cognitive capacity of each developing person, while Erikson bases his trust in the adaptive power ... rooted in each individual's emotional makeup ... Sears sees man as the creator and recipient of his own environment ... Man can pull himself up by his own bootstraps ... and purposefully organize his and his children's experience in such a way that

> he can clearly shape their future as desired ..." (Maier, 1965, p. 205)

These three theorists disagree on only the means by which individuals conquer their environments, one emphasizing cognition, the second affect, and the third behavior, but they all agree completely with the assumption that individuals make their environments. Clearly, that is the bond that makes them psychologists.

In his final revision of Motivation and Personality, Maslow revealed the way in which psychologists view the environment quite clearly.

> "Research has established an important point in discovering that individuals can be healthier, even much healthier, than the culture in which they grow and live. This is possible because of the ability of the healthy man to be detached from his surroundings, which is the same as saying that he lives by his inner laws rather than by outer pressures." (Maslow, 1970, p. 278)

To be healthy, in this model, is to not necessarily be responsive to one's surroundings. Other notables (e.g., David Reisman) have echoed this theme of inner directiveness. It is most curious that psychologists using this same construct, i.e., responsiveness to one's environment, will frequently recommend placing people into institutions rather than giving them these mental health awards.

How does such a conceptual "have it both ways" become so widely accepted? The reason is that the psychological way of knowing is an almost perfect way of explaining human behavior if one approaches it as an ideology--an advocacy of what ought to be rather than as a systematic basis for explaining human behavior. While

psychological explanations may not meet the canons of sound theory or research which predict, they more than fulfill our socio-political commitment to the importance of the individual. What it lacks as science it more than compensates for with ideals for which we will all toss our hats in the air. In the context of university organization we could more easily justify psychological study, as it pertains to human beings, as offerings of the Department of Philosophy (philosophical questions such as What is truth? What is just? What is real? What is life and its meaning? What are the eternal questions faced by human beings? What is the essence of humanness? Who am I?). These are questions for philosophical analysis which should not be masqueraded as amenable to scientific inquiry. If someone plays the flute, why not accept or reject the effort as music rather than judge it on the basis of whether or not it exterminates "x" number of rats.

I am concerned about this situation for two reasons. By overblowing one discipline our students don't realize the broad liberal/general perspective they should achieve--an education which helps them see the value and limitations of all ways of academic knowing. Second--and an even greater tragedy--is that professional education is an analogue of the larger university. Educational psychology dominates all content in professional preparation even more completely than psychology dominates the social sciences. This is especially tragic because while psychology as a field of inquiry is as useful and as limited as any other discipline,

educational psychology is the poorest imitation of the worst features of its parent field. It is like the insecure convert who still eats fish on Friday to prove he belongs. The forms of hard science are used as puffery to mask a soft, almost shapeless knowledge base. The result is that, in most teacher preparing institutions, what we call teacher education could more accurately be described as majoring in educational psychology. This is equally true in the state colleges and private institutions where there may be no department labeled "educational psychology" but where the concepts they espouse are accepted as common coin with no reflection, no thought, no counter proposal whatsoever. We uncritically attach meaning to such constructs as self-concept, transfer, internal vs. external motivation, readiness, the hierarchy of needs, reinforcement, norm-referenced testing, avoidance behavior. We use these concepts to explain to ourselves and to others what is happening in schools and in other educational institutions. We seem to believe that educational psychologists actually know how people learn. We appear to assume that school practices can be derived from their constructs.

My great apprehension is that there are people loose (i.e., educational psychologists) who do believe they know these things, that we are, in effect, their conceptual captives and that they are in control of teacher education as we know it. As a result, when we complain about the inadequacies of teacher education we are, in effect, complaining about the inadequacies of the

constructs in educational psychology. When teacher educators complain that there is no professional knowledge base it is because these very limited constructs in educational psychology do not provide such a base. When teacher educators complain that our research methodology is inadequate to deal with the most important problems in schools it is because our methods are limited to those which can be understood by educational psychologists. When teacher education is accused of being irrelevant to the problems of practicing teachers it is educational psychologists who are irrelevant. When teacher education is accused of being unable to generate predictive knowledge to anticipate behavior it is because educational psychology does not generate predictive knowledge. When teacher educators are accused of measuring the wrong things in excruciating detail it is because educational psychologists do so. And when teacher education is accused of labeling conditions--the exceptional "X," "Y," "Z,"--it is because the field of educational psychology labels and describes with no concommitant requirement that future behavior must be predicted before a label can be assumed to have any generative meaning. Real knowledge is based on generalizations that predict, and not simply on terms that classify. What does "dull normal" or "aphasia" enable us to predict? If there is no treatment and no predicted behavior, what's the difference between the use of such labels and slander?

The first critical issue then, which will characterize our legacy to teacher education, is whether we will continue to

squint through the peepholes of our present knowledge base in both general studies and in professional education, or whether we will fling open every door and window in academe and let as much light of every size, color, and intensity illuminate the study of teacher education.

There is no valid reason to single out and require the study of psychology in the general/liberal studies of future teachers any more than courses in other social sciences, physical sciences, or humanities. In the professional sequence there is a similar need to continue but diminish the time devoted to educational psychology and insure that there are equal opportunities for study in the ways of knowing derived from other academic disciplines which also seek to explain human behavior. In the graduate specializations and advanced research studies it is equally important to maintain but not limit ourselves to one system of analysis. It is not difficult to understand how 100 years ago we were captivated by the newly-emerging study of the individual psyche. Today, we have a much broader view of knowledge and a much more humble expectation for any one way of knowing.

> "Search for truth is the essence of all scholarship. Research is one aspect of this all-encompassing search. In teacher education we desperately need people who are interested and able to do research ... can we say that our [research] to date has done much to provide a forward thrust in teacher education? I am afraid that, taken as a whole, it has not. The emphasis has tended to be on descriptive rather than on the more difficult prescriptive research. Emphasis on opinion research, instead of opening new avenues to new ideas, has tended to give reactions to prevailing news and practices." (Stratemeyer, 1965)

The second generation of teacher educators saw the values and few of the limitations of ensconsing teacher education in the university. They were, of course, entirely correct in viewing higher education as the best hope for upgrading an occupation based on apprenticeship and routines into a profession which might be based on practices supported by theory and research.

In 1898 there were 167 public normal schools and even more private ones preparing elementary teachers with what really amounted to a high school education infused with some pedagogy. During this period only 114 of the 400 universities in the United States prepared secondary school teachers (Elsbree, 1939). So that in a relatively brief time span, as one measures the life of institutions, the second generation of teacher educators was remarkably effective at transforming a local craft learned through "the Sit-By-Nellie" method into a legitimate university function.

Whatever criticisms may be made of teacher training in the 19th century, however, it cannot be accused of being unrelated to practice. It was of the schools, by the schools, and for the schools. But it became painfully and increasingly clear that most teachers were semi-literate, poorly educated people, in truth, a short step (usually a chapter in a textbook) above the masses they were supposedly extricating from the pools of ignorance. Lodging teacher education into universities which have themselves improved markedly in this century has also engendered an inevitable reaction. In exchange for university-educated teachers we must now answer the

charges of being unrelated, disinterested, even hostile, to public schools. There may, in truth, be some curricular pendulum, or balance at play here: as university-based teacher education produces too few usable techniques for practitioners in relation to the problems they perceive, the cry to get teacher education out of the "ivory tower" and "into the field" is raised as if it were an original idea and not the basic state of affairs for over a century. Conversely, as anyone identifies a knowledge gap among practitioners, the solution seized upon is for another university course--as if courses have proven to be the most effective means of teacher change.

The issue faced by our generation of teacher educators is to prevent this curricular pendulum from swinging all the way back to the field. Lest we rediscover the knowledge-free practicality of the 19th century as the quick fix for tomorrow's teacher education, we must strike the balance between the university and the field which has always been called for but never achieved. A decade ago when I had more answers than I do now I wrote an article which has been reprinted continuously: "Twenty Three Reasons Universities Can't Educate Teachers" (1971). The purpose was to highlight the imprisonment of teacher education in a setting which prevents true cooperation with public schools as institutions. Unfortunately, such forms of clever complaining may contribute to, rather than alleviate, the problems of institutional cooperation. I am not now able to state that I believe it is possible for universities and schools to truly complement each other but, unless our generation of

teacher educators reaches rapprochement with the public schools, the pendulum may well sweep us back into a situation of local superintendents and school districts awarding licences and states making alternative arrangements with non-university centers to compete with the approved university program approach.

This issue is not simply the usual dichotomy described as the gap between theory and practice, although it is true that to some degree practitioners describe everything that happens in the university as "theory" and professors define all events in the schools as "practice." In these instances the term is used by each group in a pejorative manner and dismisses the other institution's activities as unusable or unworthy of consideration.

The issue being considered here refers to the basic institutional problem of cooperation of which the gap between theory and practice is merely a symptom.

What should be the <u>institutional</u> relationship between schools and colleges of education and public elementary and secondary schools? Traditionally, schools and colleges of Education <u>as institutions</u> have avoided taking institutional positions, yet, Education Deans, directors of student teaching and faculty acceptable to public schools as consultants have acted as if teacher education <u>naturally and obviously</u> supports public schools and should do all that is possible to enhance them. Numerous individual faculty, however, many of them well known and highly respected, have operated on other assumptions and advocacies: that education is lifelong; that it occurs in many

institutions, through a variety of media and in innumerable settings; and that public schools need to be seriously reevaluated before they should be permitted to continue in their present form.

This question of institutional relationship offers schools of education a choice between the role of technical advisor or adversial critic. In the former role inservice teachers and other school personnel are the primary client groups of schools of education which, as institutions, assume some degree of responsibility for preparing them and for improving their services. In this posture schools of education have a tacit political alliance with the public schools. This position supports the contention that schools of Education will survive and thrive to the extent that public schools do since the raison d'etre for education professors is primarily in preservice education and then as inside critics and technical consultants.

If the latter role of neutral analyst and external critic is more characteristic of how schools of education relate to public schools, then the primary client group of schools of education is the public at large and expert colleagues in other institutions of higher education who seek to advance knowledge in an environment of academic freedom. Among these faculty it is assumed that their primary roles are as experts in education, broadly conceived, and their apparent expectation is that the university of the future will retain schools of education, well stocked with education professors who will be needed to make insightful analyses of education in a variety of human settings.

Heretofore schools and colleges of education have sought to have the benefits of both positions and the liabilities of neither. We support the public schools to the degree we need them as training sites for students and as potential employers of graduates but not to the degree that we identify school teachers as being in the same profession as education professors, or to the degree that we would involve ourselves in seeking increased tax support for the public schools since such support might be subtracted from the higher education budget. At the same time, back at the university--the setting we take refuge in when the public schools ask for direct, partisan political support--we ask for all forms of special treatment because we claim a need to serve the public schools and should, therefore, not be subject to the same regulations as the other campus units.

Institutionally, our official stance is to hold the public schools at arms' length so that we may remain free to demur from anything they stand for or get mixed up in which we may find inconvenient, compromising, or inappropriate for high level college types. Yet, we claim a very special public school role when we ask the university for special considerations regarding when and for how long classes must meet to award credit; special considerations for workload, merit, promotion, and summer assignments; special consideration for admission, retention and grading practices.

The net effect of this "let's have the best of both worlds with none of the disadvantages" has been the marked degree of

alienation from either support group which now characterizes teacher education. Our university colleagues suspect us, not simply because we lack rigor, but because we lack pride in the people we prepare--whether those people are beginning teachers or school superintendents. At the same time, our public school colleagues and alumni suspect us because with all our claims for impartial scholarship and academic freedom we don't seem to be able to provide them with sufficiently useful insights to address the problems they regard as most important. It seems to me that we have painted ourselves into a corner with no advocates in either academe--where the other schools and colleges now await the reallocation of our resources, or in the public schools where practitioners feel no real stake in the enhancement or even maintenance of a nearby school of education. If you believe this description to be an exaggeration of our state of suspension between the university and the public school, consider the following two questions:

1. Are public school people as capable as faculty of revising college preparation programs? Are they truly equal partners?
2. Do schools of education in comparison to other campus units receive a fair share of the university budget, of scholarships and fellowships, and a fair share of internal research support?

If the answer to both questions in your setting is "yes," then obviously my description of teacher education suspended between

institutional settings is an inaccurate metaphor. If your answer to either of the questions is "yes," then your institution has a clear identity in the university or in the schools and my contentions are again incorrect. Those who answer both questions with "not really" but who still believe there is a "good" working relationship between their school of education and the local public schools ought to seriously consider what is being described as a profession-wide institutional dislocation.

The question for us is, Will our legacy be viewed in retrospect as the period in which the current in the gulf between the university and the schools accelerated into a waterfall, or will we somehow slow--even alter--this current? My hope, perhaps naive, is that by broadening our theoretic and research base beyond educational psychology we will simultaneously prove to public schools that we can be more useful and to the university that we can produce an increased quantity of genuine professional literature. This still will not solve the inherent political differences and dislocations between the schools and universities <u>as bureaucracies</u>; however, my hope--admittedly idealistic--is that greater involvement with the schools and greater effectiveness as an academic enterprise is an interactive effect: improving at one set of activities causes us to improve at the other.

I have not here even raised the issue of broadening the mission of schools of education into other human services. The implications of this trend, should it become one, for reraising

the legitimacy of whether schools of education belong in the university is obvious. In the short term, expanding offerings and gaining more Student Credit Hours would seem to be in the best interests of schools of education. In the long term, however, the question of the role and legitimacy of our programs may be an even greater issue than decremental budgeting. Is the university likely to raise or lower its commitments to schools of education as their roles are broadened? Is the university more or less likely to legitimize such a broadened role?

Our place in the university setting, achieved by the second generation of teacher educators is neither stable nor secure. To some degree, it will be up to us to refashion it anew as we face the issues of defining our institutional role and our proper relation to the public schools and to other institutions.

But others are also involved! It is a constant source of amazement and consternation to read manuscripts from teacher educators which describe schools of education staking out radical new missions for themselves with no reference to the larger university structure in which they operate. Do we really believe we can directly respond to societal and professional goals with no reference to the university structure as an intervening variable?

The perceptions of university colleagues outside of professional education, of lay people who control the total university budget and mission, and of the general public, may prove to be a more influential determinant of the school of education's role in

the future than any views which emanate from teacher educators or school practitioners. Our legacy will be shaped from two directions: the influence of external forces and university forces which impinge on teacher education; and the impact which teacher education can reflect back to the university and to external institutions.

The university-wide administrators, regents and state legislators whom I have observed for the last seven years assume that schools of education are partners with public schools. Any debate about the values of this partnership seems to come from education faculty free of the institutional facts of life and not from those responsible for legislating about or funding teacher education. This leads to the curious question of whether teacher educators really understand their own best self interests.

The conditions which resulted from our third legacy--the growth of specialized and varied educational roles--is also now under (re)consideration. As education became more widely and intensely studied the development of specialized roles was inevitable. Since almost all specializations required prerequisite teacher preparation and classroom experience the training for the specialized nonteaching roles occurred on post baccalaureate levels. This led to the well-known dichotomy: classroom teachers being typically prepared as undergraduates and almost every supporting role requiring graduate training. Since salaries and prestige are, in part, a function of graduate training, classroom teachers were ascribed lower status than those in specialized roles. The mechanism of paying teachers according to the college credit they accumulate and then making teacher preparation a lower level of study than preparation for nonteaching has created the "we get no respect" effect which characterizes the teaching profession. One reason education is not viewed as a bonafide profession is because of this anomaly: the regular practitioner (i.e., the classroom teacher) is a lower form of bureaucratic functionary than those whose very existence is justified on the basis of facilitating the teacher's work (i.e., the special teacher, the guidance counselor, the curriculum coordinator, etc.).

In retrospect the desire to have every specialist understand the work of the teacher was a well-intentioned motive for pushing the preparation of specialists' roles to higher levels.

Another option might have been to require as much or more advanced graduate training for classroom teachers. However, those who took advanced study to improve as teachers were always much fewer in number than teachers seeking another role, or salary advancement.

But forces other than the level at which teacher preparation vis a vis specialist preparation occurred were at play. Admittedly, while other motives for specialization may not have been as great an influence as a reward system based on accumulating college credits, there were other important causes: the academic interests of graduate education faculty became increasingly narrow and specialized--in this sense similar to other faculty engaged in advanced graduate study; public school administrators and the public at large came to believe that more specialists would improve schooling; expanded doctoral programs led to increasing numbers adding to ever-narrower topics; the growth of government and other forms of external funding supported specialized school roles--especially the training of on-site researchers; the special needs of constituencies, (e.g., the disadvantaged, the handicapped, the bilingual) led to many new specializations; finally, the need to publish is an important fact of academic life which also led to more specialized roles and interests.

There are many groups--including those who represent classroom teachers--who believe that the specialization of roles has now proliferated well beyond any genuine needs. They call for a reconsideration of the more than forty specialties which now

characterize many schools of education. It is not uncommon to find that the initial impetus in many schools of education to prepare graduates for nonschool roles did not emanate from some broad commitment to human services or to an expanded view of education, but arose in an unreflected manner from doctoral students completing highly specialized programs who were simply not employable in the traditional places.

Critics of this trend are not only those who believe that specialization has gone too far to be practically useful in schools, or in other occupations, but academics who contend that much of the research and writing now representative of the specializations is idiosyncratic or cult oriented rather than a genuine contribution to any professional literature. Academic critics describe the theory, research and writing which undergirds these specialized roles as duplicative and lacking in substance. I believe this criticism to be correct, but readily explainable and most amenable to solution.

Research in professional education deals directly with theoretic constructs from educational psychology which will account for up to 15 per cent of human behavior but which will inevitably exclude constructs from most of the social sciences and from all other ways of knowing. In addition, however, what we consider research to be and how we conduct it is limited by individuals trained with an educational psychologist's view of form, procedure, and methodology. The results of our peeping

through this one knothole are tautologies such as the following:

Case 1. We have a formidable "body" (pile?) of research in education which simply justifies training. Ordinary people thinking in ordinary ways would simply accept the idea that people can be trained. Ordinary people even go further and assume that people who are trained in a particular skill (which is not used in daily living) would naturally learn the skill more readily than people not trained in such a skill.

Every year I read innumerable studies--accepted by our most respected researchers who act as referees for research manuscripts which reach a conclusion such as the following: "If you teach X Group something and don't teach Y Group the same something then X Group will learn this something significantly better." There is no validation of the importance or usefulness of the material; all we get is simply the bald fact that some material can be successfully taught. In most of these cases there is not even a comparison of the training procedures used; we don't even know if one way to learn the material is better than another way. What we "learn" from such "research" is that a group of people who are taught something learn it better than a group not taught the same thing.

I don't believe such "research" constitutes an advancement of knowledge, nor does it add new data to our understanding, nor does it verify any theory of human behavior, nor does it provide any empiric guidelines for future behavior, nor does it

lead to any fruitful hypotheses, nor does it help to explain any problem or the causes of any problem, or even the factors involved in any problem. We are simply told, "This is it; it's research."

Personally, I cannot accept the need to unnecessarily verify the obvious. Reasonable people will continue to assume that training will be more beneficial than nontraining; reasonable people will continue to deprecate our efforts if we accept this as "research."

Case #2. Given enough training with the same material, two people can be taught to see the same things in the same way and to record it in the same way. Such agreement is obviously important when training observers. The question is why is it research when we document that a level of agreement and reliability between observers has been reached? The goodness, accuracy, fruitfulness, validity of what these observers are seeing are the tough questions but they go unanswered. Instead, we are given the procedural details of some piece of training and the "finding" is made that x amount of inter-rater reliability has been reached. The question is, So what? I wouldn't be surprised to find telephone operators in a hospital who can give you a number if you give them a name or vice versa and further, that there are two or more operators who would agree on the information they give out. Is training these operators conducting research?

Case 3. Finding out the obvious is defended as "verification research." The question is, Should there be any

criteria for determining what needs to be verified? Is the fact that pencils can be sharpened in need of verification? Is the fact that teachers get to school at different times in need of verification? How about the fact that teachers have different effects with different students, or with the same student at different times? Clearly, the need for verification is primarily a function of experience. If I am from Mars the pencil sharpening may need to be verified. Similarly, if a group of researchers with little classroom experience determines that teachers who are "warm," "vibrant," 'enthusiastic," will teach more than dull, boring, tired teachers, it is the equivalent of the researchers being from Mars. Finding facts which are exciting to the ignorant but common knowledge to the experienced is not research.

In teacher education the sad truth is that what most college supervisors and classroom teachers have long accepted as common knowledge, is ignored until those with no school experience who are our "educational researchers" self-discover the obvious. In a real sense, if all teachers know something, from years of daily experience, it will not prevent a "researcher" ignorant of school practice from verifying the obvious.

In psychology when one conjures up a construct such as self concept which is beyond smell, touch, sight, taste, or hearing, there is a logical need to conduct studies which include behavioral manifestations which can be attributed to this construct and thereby verify its existence. To apply the term "verification

studies" to teaching studies, however, is merely to mask the practice of ignoring the common knowledge of practitioners--knowledge which is frequently based on behavioral manifestations over long periods in a variety of settings.

Several of our most prestigious, notable researchers have recently summarized the results of teacher effectiveness studies and five experiments dealing with teacher adoption of new practices in the following manner:

> "In order for teachers to adopt new practices it is important to a) state the recommendation in easily ... understood language; b) develop in teachers ... a philosophical acceptance of the practices; and c) convince teachers that the time and effort spent in incorporating the changes in their daily classroom procedures will improve their students' achievement. [Further] ... it is advisable to collect both a) observational data on the fidelity of treatment implementation, and b) descriptive data on how teachers perceive the proposed changes." (Mohlman, Coladarci, and Gage, 1982)

This review of the literature concludes with the conjecture that the length and intensity of inservice training should be tailored to the type of practices being recommended and the teachers' reactions to these practices.

Consider what this high level distillation of our research base reveals to us. First, teachers need to understand a proposed change to implement it. Second, it helps if teachers believe in the change. Third, teachers like changes that help students learn. Fourth, observations should be made to see what teachers do to actually implement the change. And fifth, it's good to describe how

teachers perceive proposed changes.

This is the penultimate summary of our research literature on teacher change! Is the criticism we receive from our academic colleagues that our research lacks substance really completely unfair?

Case #4. In this genre of study the "researcher" recognizes that the practitioner's experience may be of value: not valuable enough, however, to have practitioners' help in framing the hypothesis of the studies. Determining what to study is reserved to "researchers"--those untroubled by too much classroom experience. Teachers, interns, students are involved not as helpers in determining hypotheses but as subjects, as perceivers. The knothole of the educational psychologist supports the assumption that if we want to know the problems of beginners we must ask them; if we want to know the problems of student teachers we simply ask them; if we want to know the problems of experienced teachers we ask them. Let us be very clear. This is not using practitioner's experience in the most important part of any research, the development of the hypothesis to be tested. It is following the psychological paradigm that since the solution to any problem lies essentially within the client's power, then his/her perception is the field of study.

This is one way to explain human behavior (possibly 15 per cent correct) which ignores the factors in the setting which control behavior and which are studied by all the various disciplines

of social and physical science. As a result, we have a literature of teacher problems which catalogues beginners'(and others') problems and which distorts and exaggerates their importance. We know, for example, that beginners see gaps in their preparation, particularly in the areas of classroom management, the teaching of skills to varying levels of students, the teaching of handicapped students and those with special needs. We learn further that the teachers are troubled by numerous classroom interruptions and other bureaucratic intrusions on their work.

These perceptions are an important piece of the puzzle; however, they are far from a full explanation of what happens to beginners and other practitioners. Asking people "What hurts?" is a vital, necessary ingredient in any professional analysis. It cannot, however, subsume a system of analyses which includes all the factors which may be external to the perceiver but which control his/her behavior.

The result of our willingness to recognize little else beside individual perception in studying teachers' problems is that we have a growing literature which can explain only a limited portion of the range of problems facing beginners and other practitioners. We study teachers in the same way that other disciplines use college students as handy subjects. This is not the same as involving the subjects in problem definition--which must be done with our subjects if they are professional practitioners.

Case #5 refers to the studies that deal with feedback. Ordinary thinking among ordinary people would lead to the assumption that if Group A is given criticism of some sort and Group B is not that Group A will be more likely to implement such criticism. Nevertheless, we are presented with "research" which insists on finding this out for us. No knowledge is necessarily advanced from these studies about the value of the feedback, or the method of giving it, or the setting in which it occurs. We are simply informed that the group that gets feedback is more likely to use it and that this is "research" knowledge.

Case 6 refers to primarily doctoral dissertations and to studies done by faculty seeking to justify a new course. In this genre teachers are shown to be inadequate in some skill or subject matter which the "researcher" has decided s/he wants to advocate as part of the required curriculum for all teachers. The range of these ostensible shortcomings is broad and varied: social studies teachers don't know enough geography; science teachers don't know enough about the study of meteorology or space physics; language teachers cannot converse fluently in the languages they teach; physical educators don't know enough dance activities; English teachers are unfamiliar with three leading American poets, etc. The reasons this literature must be suspect is that I have never read a single study which shows teachers to be adequate in the skill which the "researcher" has decided to study. Anything a particular "researcher" has decided beforehand to be a deficiency is substantiated as one. Is this research?

(For the sake of brevity I have not included those forms of research which successfully deal with important problems in teacher education in a useful, productive manner. The first category are status studies which provide an overview of a field and then point toward new directions based on such taking stock. Yager (1982) is a good example of projecting science education needs based on some data. A second category are studies exemplified by Stevens (1982) which compare a group of student teachers with a group of regular teachers in terms of their effect on pupils. Third, are studies which seek to support or refute some theoretic construct of human development. Sprinthall and Glassberg (1980) are a good example. Fourth, are studies such as Sprinthall (1980) which deal with the process of student teaching and the effects of human interaction during professional laboratory experiences. Fifth, are state of the art summaries which support or refute rival alternate hypotheses. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981) do this in considering the total effects of teacher education.

These five types of studies indicate that some with psychological orientations, but others as well, can study important problems in ways which have theoretic value and relevance for practicing teacher educators. Unfortunately, the number of these studies in proportion to those described previously as unnecessary or spurious is abysmally low.)

The problems with these six kinds of studies is that they constitute the majority of the "research" we have which relates directly to the preparation of teachers and specialists. One explanation for this condition is that researchers usually pursue hypotheses derived from published literature but practitioners do not publish what they know. The literature is in libraries and data banks and the experience is with the practitioner. Every decade we try to resurrect the action research movement which would involve practitioners as partners and it falters. The usual excuse is that classroom teachers are not interested in collecting data. The truth is that classroom teachers are perfectly willing to collect data on <u>their</u> problems; it's the imposed hypotheses they see little value in. The problem is that our researchers are unwilling or incapable of casting the questions to be studied in ways that practitioners also see value in them.

The legacy we leave to teacher education will require us to rethink and reshape the specializations developed by a previous generation of teacher educators. I have contended that we need to open our research models to the full spectrum of methods and constructs which are derived from all academic disciplines. We need to stop pretending that rediscovering the obvious and ignoring the critical--the result of limiting our research to one way of knowing--can give us the academic base we need to support forty or more specializations. Perhaps a period of decremental budgeting may

require us to do what ought to be done anyway; that is, to search for commonalities in roles and to conduct studies which connect conceptualizations from several disciplines with each other and with practice. How we get the broad kind of researchers we need will be a continuing problem. Doctoral programs which are truly interdisciplinary may be one way; support for efforts which involve teachers as genuine partners in gathering data is unquestionably another. Of all the unimplemented ideas in education, action research is still the greatest.

Our legacy will require us to rethink the very limited nature of our current specializations. Professional research should seek to test proposed solutions to practitioner's problems, or to support or refute theoretical constructs related to teaching. Who is involved in this determination will certainly determine the nature and value of our university studies. In order to improve our scholarship a broader range of academic fields will need to be represented in future.

The fourth generation of teacher educators established the commitment to make improved schooling a significant force in people's lives. For the majority this meant efforts to make schooling more applicable to problems of living: for various minority constituencies this meant trying to equalize their school opportunities and their subsequent life options. This legacy, just as the previous three, was assumed by many to be so thoroughly established that no challenge would be possible. We are now, as a nation, engaged in a process of rethinking the social uses of schooling which will have profound implications for teacher education.

The most critical educational decision before the American people is now a philosophical one: is public education a personal or a common good? This debate was supposedly settled by the Puritans in 1648, when they established common schools for the purpose of ensuring the continuance of their communal society. From the beginning educators have acted on the belief that it is a commonly-held American belief that schools bear some responsibility for the quality of life. Inducting thirty million immigrants into American society, supporting the dissemination of science and technology into every facet of living, developing student potentialities--marketable ones and others--and fostering the commitment to participate in democratic processes, all fell within the purview of the schools. But educators have apparently assumed too much regarding the public's understanding of what schools are intended to accomplish.

As educators we are now in a period of reconsidering the truths which we have neglected to advocate because we have assumed them to be self evident and generally accepted. They are neither. My reading of current American opinion is that education is essentially conceived of as a personal good. And even more, not personal in the sense of individualized whereby students may develop in all forms of achievement, but personal in the sense of a good which refers to marketable skills.

Education is frequently defined as a personal possession: "something no one can take away from you." We "market" education. We seek to convince individuals that they should invest in it as if

it were the purchase of a commodity which they will own, rather than seeking to convince them that it is a communal need as vital as the need for police, sanitation, or transportation.

In this period of decremental budgeting, which will undoubtedly intensify, the public has been conditioned to view education in terms of user fees--with the user or beneficiary defined as the student, not including those who come into contact with the student or who will have to share life space with the student. There is a wide range of constituencies who are approached to support the user fee concept: the elderly who are told they have no children in school; the expanding variety of religious groups who seek to safeguard everyone's morality; the wealthy who have always supported private education; those opposed to racial integration; advocates of the gifted and other special interests; and the broad range of middle class persons in urban areas who do not regard the public schools as safe. These expanding constituencies are natureal adherents of the philosophy that education is essentially a personal good which should be supported by user fees. It is not inconceivable that by the year 2000 public schools will be inhabited by primarily low-income rural groups and by the poor who inhabit metropolitan areas, with most others in some form of school supported in greatest measure by user fees. Charles Dickens will return in the 21st century.

It would be most difficult to regard such a fractionization of the public schools as working to make us a stronger people, clearer of purpose and joined together to more successfully deal

with the issues of peace, the economy, energy, the environment, the increase of life opportunities, or anything else. And that's precisely the point. The value which undergirds the philosophy that education is a personal good is essentially drawn from a combination of 19th century economic liberalism laced with a heavy dose of social Darwinism. If each person pursues his/her own best economic interests the common good will not only take care of itself but be served best. Freedom of opportunity will be guaranteed not by any preparation for collective activity but by emphasizing students' readiness for a specific job.

It is against this setting that education is viewed as an analogue of this economic philosophy. In order for education to be effective it too will have to involve self-selection, be self-supporting and be freely chosen in a competitive market. Sellers improve their products as buyers demand more--assuming of course that buyers know what they want and can pay for it. This freedom to choose is supposedly available to all. (Voltaire once defined the law, in all its majestic equality, as that which prohibits the rich as well as the poor from sleeping under bridges, begging in the streets and stealing bread.) The educational nirvana is promised if we simply let the poor as well as the rich and the highly educated as well as the barely literate, have the same opportunity to find, select and pay for their own schooling. The rationale for this is twofold: since education is a personal good it should be personally paid for; and educational services

like any other services will improve most when there are competing vendors. The goal is to free the market from the present oligarchy to a situation of unencumbered, open competition.

It should be noted that this philosophy does not pursue the freedom of choice theme in order to enhance human development or individual differences. Marketable skills are the common objective for all. Strange as it seems, it is education conceived as a social good which stresses individual development on the assumption that a diverse citizenry is the soundest means for supporting a diversified economy and a democratic society. In short, if education is a personal good, then marketable skills are the primary ends. If education is a common good, the ability to function in an occupation is merely the means of fulfilling larger goals.

The application of the personal good concept to higher education is already well advanced. It may not be long before this approach is accepted as the goal of secondary education as well. If this occurs, how soon before teacher education is also defined as a personal good?

The connection between the various levels of schooling appears to follow an inexorable logic. Schooling is a personal good because it prepares people for jobs. The best preparation for jobs are basic skills. If basic skills are the essence of the school curriculum then teachers can be trained who are primary skills tutors, which is itself a form of vocational education and a personal good. In this paradigm there is no basis for supporting either

public education or teacher training with other than user fees. Both teachers and children are being trained in marketable skills for achieving a personal good--employment.

It seems to me that there is no way that teacher educators can avoid becoming involved in this debate if we intend to argue that teacher education is a common good. What is the argument for education as a common good and what is its relationship to teacher education?

The way out of this morass is to redefine basic skills. The present narrowing of elementary school curriculum to literacy and some basic computational skills must be aggressively contested. The real basic skills go way beyond the 3 R's and include the secondary curriculum as well. The real basics derive from the fields of human knowledge and connect the major concepts of those fields to the problems of living. The real basics lead to education for the common good.

Basic skills of literacy and numerical computation are <u>minimum</u>, <u>not</u> <u>maximum</u> standards for our schools. In order to function in a democratic society on more than a survival level we need men and women who are broadly educated to deal with the responsibilities and opportunities our society offers.

What people should learn in order to be considered "educated" derives from many fields of knowledge. "The basics" are ideas needed throughout life. They can be addressed, in some form, in first grade, in the university and in continuing education.

While there are numerous others, I would suggest the following examples as concepts which exemplify such general education. We might regard these understandings as just a few of "the basics" for living in a modern, democratic society.

Communication

-All persons are, to some degree, public.

-Communication is the central human behavior.

-Communication, while ubiquitous and cheap, can never be guaranteed.

History

-The extent to which the future can be anticipated is a function of thoroughness in understanding the past.

-Documentation controls historical fact.

Philosophy

-How does one think in universal terms (philosophically)?

Political Science

-The rules are never neutral.

-All government decisions are interim.

-Political activists never represent the majority.

-Majority rules, minority rights.

Mathematics

-Zero, infinity and balance are key concepts of mathematics.

-Mathematics is a language for expressing logical relationships.

-(Operations on numbers are a small part of mathematics.)

Economics

-The theory of price determination is based on generalizations regarding price and quantity.

-Scarcity, real cost, production, capital, growth, money supply, etc., are interrelated generalizations.

Psychology

-Human behavior can best be understood and predicted by studying the behavior of individuals.

Sociology

-Human behavior can best be understood and predicted by studying the group behavior of people in social institutions--work, family, school.

Anthropology

-Human behavior can best be understood and predicted by total immersion in the life of a community.

Geography

-Human behavior can best be understood and predicted by studying the relation of people to their life space.

Geology

-Time is also a geologic concept.

-Organic and inorganic evolution refer to systematic developments and are interrelated.

-Energy: Nature to be commanded must be obeyed.

Architecture

-The ordering and organization of human environments

not only reflects the culture but shapes it.

-Human behavior reflects a reaction to the built as well as the natural environment.

Botany

-Green plants, given essential elements and environment, can produce their own food through photosynthesis--the conversion of light energy to chemical energy.

Physical Education

-All human movement is functional, sport, exercise or dance.

-Human functions have integrity: mind vs. body distinctions are artificial.

-Gross motor behavior promotes wellness.

Arts

-Music is based on the concepts of tempo, tonality, and harmony.

-Dance is a function of time, effort, and shape.

-Visual arts utilize color, shape, texture and divisions of space.

Science

-What is scientifically true is determined by specific procedures of scientific investigation.

-The law of conservation means that mass and energy can be accounted for even though transformed.

Literature

-Creative writing is not the province of a special few.

-Literary analyses deal with stating criteria for assessing "goodness."

International Relations

-The process of identifying parallel interests or "trade offs" permits nations to negotiate.

The process of narrowing the purposes of schooling down from concepts such as these to the skills of word recognition and the performance of basic arithmetic has the direct effect of cheapening the value of public education. It is not necessary to spend 13 years, full time, at a cost of $3,000 per year, per pupil to teach most normal people to read on grade level and to compute their bank interest.

Indirectly, the narrowing of purposes and redefining school as a personal good also affects the work of the teacher and teacher education. The teacher becomes essentially a classroom manager and a skills tutor. This role concept overemphasizes the technical functions of teaching. It also makes the daily work of the teacher similar to other jobs in industrial society and much less like the practice of any profession.

The literature on the problems of beginning teachers and on burn out among the more experienced can be explained by various hypotheses. The most common explanations are variations of a common

theme: that education students are prepared for the best of all non-existent schools; or that the demands made by schools are truly the unique expectations of a strange setting. These analyses seek to explain the beginner's problems as resulting from an attempt to become enculturated to an atypical social institution. It seems to me there is a more direct explanation: one which will more readily explain the problems of induction.

Beginners take jobs. Frequently, this is the first full-time job they have ever taken. In the case of older students it may be the first job they have ever been formally prepared for. In almost all cases it is the first job most students regard as having lifetime potential. It is inevitable that one attaches less importance to problems in a summer or temporary job than to problems encountered in a position one anticipates as being permanent. It may very well be that what we call the "induction literature" simply ignores the day-to-day problems of any regular jobholder. Most people have all manner of gripes about their work. Most people believe themselves to be underpaid, overworked, and underappreciated. Most people believe their bosses, if not dumb, issue lots of stupid directives. Most people know precisely how to reorganize their office, factory, or store if only they had the power to do so. Most people get tired, very tired, of working and wish they had more time off. Almost all people in all jobs can give chapter and verse on how the bureaucratic rules and regulations of "the system" prevent rather than facilitate their achieving the stated goals of their organizations.

What we are experiencing in teacher education is not that our preparation does not lead to usable practices, nor are the expectations placed on beginners a bizarre set of demands. What we are experiencing is the simple phenomenon of people taking jobs--jobs they expect to stay in. And most jobs, once they are actually begun, are rarely the satisfying, self-fulfilling, socially recognized roles we would like them to be. The essential problem with the "problem" literature is that it does not make a comparative analysis against beginners or experienced practitioners in other fields. Once nurses, social workers, criminal justice people--any persons in human service occupations--are used as a comparison group the problems of beginning teachers are similar to the griping typical of jobholders in human service organizations. When compared to business jobs, however, teachers do have less flexibility and opportunity. (Stark, Lowther, Austin, 1982, p. 10)

Thus far I have discussed the trend to redefine education as a personal good, to narrow goals and to thereby limit the way in which teachers view their work. My contention is that our generation of teacher educators cannot assume that because preceding generations of teacher educators operated in a society which viewed schooling more broadly and as capable of equalizing people and life opportunities, that we will automatically continue as heir to these grand assumptions. At present, when compared to issues such as peace, inflation, energy, jobs, housing, social security, health, the environment, etc., education is not even on the national agenda.

In order to get some indication of whether the present social forces are likely to continue, I have been reading in the

literature of goals projects and futurism. Regardless of whether one reads about metro-areas, states, the nation, or world, there seems to be a concensus of foreboding. It might be summarized as follows: "Overall, the mood of most scenarios for the 80's is moderately pessimistic. This is more than simply the fear of change. It is concern that change will be for the worse." (Graven, 1980)

Examining the literature of futurism reminds me of W. H. Auden's quip, "Thou shall not sit with statisticians nor commit a social science." In any event, in an attempt to avoid extremists and idealogues I selected a well-written report by the Citizen's League of Minneapolis. By any criterion this group must be considered enlightened, moderate, and having a history of concern for the common good. Surely, their vision of the future would have some predictive validity for the social setting in which education will be operating in future. Among other things this document states:

> "It may be time to slow the trend toward ... professionals doing things for other people and to reemphasize the ability of people to do things for themselves ... There needs to be an anti-monopoly concept applied to the public sector, to give ... elected bodies some leverage over their bureaucracy ... Service systems should be made more responsive to their users. But more advisory committees and planning committees and evaluation committees represent simply more 'voice.' There should be more of an opportunity for consumers/citizens/users to 'influence' the behavior of a service organization simply by walking away, to one they like better." (Graven, p.6)

This distinction between participation by "voice" behavior vs. "exit" behavior is from Albert O. Hirshman.

> "The essential idea can be simply stated. There are two alternative ways in which an institution's failing behavior can be corrected. The people can stay, and 'talk it out': in a marriage, in a business firm, in a church, in a city. This is voice. Or they can walk away: from a marriage, from a business, from a troubled church, from the city. This is exit. Hirshman was bothered by the implications of exit. It carries a sense of disloyalty to the institution. Yet he was troubled, too, by the notion that it should be forbidden. Systems with 'no exit' oppress people. When people begin to exit it is a signal an institution is beginning to fail; that is a troubling but basically healthy sign that the appeals for reform inside the institution should be heeded. Exit is needed, therefore, to make voice more effective.
>
> ... In Hirshman's terms, the problem in the country is an excessive reliance on voice ... Elections are voice. Public hearings are voice. Advisory committees are voice. Initiative and referendum are voice. Goal setting and planning commissions are voice. As more and more activities migrate into the public sector, for planning or for decision, the total volume of voice expands. And, to the extent that other institutions begin to operate like government, voice expands still further.
>
> ... We all begin to participate, as voting members, in more and more institutions: in city government, in our neighborhood council, in our school, in our labor union, in our political party, perhaps in the affairs of the organization for which we work. We stay and talk it out. ... the counter argument is that the system could benefit from an increase in the use of exit ... there is an appealing kind of evaluation conducted by the users of a system, as they choose to come or not; and to stay or leave, as an organization and its services change ... it is the choice between 'producer democracy' and 'consumer democracy.' (Graven, pp. 14-15)

What the Citizen's League in Minneapolis, as well as most other Americans, are now saying to government agencies--including

schools and universities--is, "Stop trying to involve us as partners. We haven't gotten the results we hoped for from you with voice or producer democracy. We want to reserve our right to exert exit or consumer democracy." In addition, there is the very clear message that government and professionals will have to do less for people and that difficult priorities will be set; that some things will be left undone is inevitable.

This is very difficult for educators to understand, let alone accept. Most of us in universities and public schools don't even recognize that when the public discusses government expense and public employees they mean us!

I would contend that the fourth legacy of teacher education--relevance to social issues--is going to be reshaped. We as teacher educators will be asked to turn down our rhetoric and simultaneously demonstrate we can have greater impact on school goals.

In this paper I have reviewed the contributions of previous teacher educators in terms of four legacies. My expectation is that the contribution of our generation of teacher educators will require reshaping the previous legacies rather than staking out new frontiers. I believe that our consolidation of these previous achievements can be a contribution of equal if not greater value. If the legacy of the first generation of teacher educators is broadened to include

the full range of disciplines which now contribute to an understanding of human behavior we will indeed have made a remarkable contribution. If we seek to enhance our standing in the university and simultaneously establish genuine professional partnerships with public schools as organizations we will be realizing the unfulfilled goal of our second generation. If we base the advanced specializations of our third generation as well as our preservice programs on more than one way of knowing, there will be no limit to the quality of our knowledge base. And finally, if we generate a national reconsideration of education so that it is once again accepted as a common--rather than a personal--good, our legacy will indeed be a great contribution.

There is, of course, always the danger that we will simply be victims of our times and merely "back into" the future. By recognizing where we have been and the societal forces now impinging on us, however, I believe we can have at least some input in shaping our future. Hopefully, we will be available in 2000 to make a clearer determination of what our generation of teacher educators has actually contributed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Elsbree, William S., The American Teacher. American Book Co., New York: 1939.

Graven, David L. (Chairman). Issues of the '80's: Enlarging Our Capacity to Adapt. Citizens League, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1980. p. 3; p. 6; pp. 14-15.

Haberman, Martin. Twenty Three Reasons Universities Can't Educate Teachers. Journal of Teacher Education. Spring 1971.

Maier, Henry W. Three Theories of Child Development. Harper and Row. New York: 1965. p. 205.

Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality (2nd Edition) Harper and Row, New York: 1970, p. 278.

Mohlman, George; Coladarci, Theodore, and Gage, N. L., Comprehension and Attitude as Predictors of Implementation of Teacher Training. (To appear in the Journal of Teacher Education) p. 10 of unpublished ms.

Sprinthall, Norman A., and Glassberg, Sally. Student Teaching: A Developmental Approach. Journal of Teacher Education. March/April 1980. V. XXXI, No. 2.

Stark, Joan S., Lowther, Malcolm A., Austin, Ann E. The Teaching Profession: Career Satisfaction High! Mobility and Responsibility Limited. (Manuscript in review by Journal of Teacher Education)

Stevens, Dorothy Jo. A Comparison of Preservice Students with Experienced Teachers in Terms of Their Effects on 8th Graders Math. Accepted for publication, Journal of Teacher Education, 1982.

Stratemeyer, F. B. Perspectives on Action in Teacher Education. Sixth Charles W. Hunt lecture, AACTE. Chicago, IL p. 27.

Thies-Sprinthall, Lois. Supervision: An Educative or Miseducative Process. Journal of Teacher Education. July/August 1980. V. XXXI, No. 4.

Yager, Robert. A Review of Science Education in Graduate Centers. Accepted for publication, Journal of Teacher Education. 1982.

Zeichner, Kenneth M., and Tabachnick, B. Robert. Are the Effects of University Teacher Education Washed Out By School Experience? Journal of Teacher Education. May/June 1981. V. XXXII, No. 3